DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 272 SP 014 201

AUTHOR Copeland, Willis D.
TITLE Supervisory Approach and Gender Related Preferences of Teachers-in-Training.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Supervisors; Cooperating Teachers; Interpersonal Relationship; *Sex Differences; Sex Role; *Student Teachers; *Supervisory Methods; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

Fifty-four male and female student teachers' preferences for direct or nondirect supervision and male or female supervisors were sampled by recording their reactions to one of four randomly assigned supervisory conferences, which differed in relation to the direct or nondirect behavior of the supervisor and to the supervisor's sex. A significant interaction effect was found between supervisory approach and subject gender, suggesting the preference for the directive approach may be qualified by the student teacher's sex. Evidence was also found that student teachers tend to prefer supervisors of the opposite sex. A preference for the directive approach to supervision appears to exist among all student teachers. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170272

Supervisory Approach and Gender Related Preferences of Teachers-in-Training[1]

Willis D. Copeland

University of California
Santa Barbara

April, 1979

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Willis D. Copeland

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 014 201

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1979.

ABSTRACT

The affective dispositions of male and female secondary student teachers toward the credibility and utility of supervisors depicted in recorded examples were recorded using semantic differential techniques. The examples differed as to the direct or non-direct approach used by the supervisor and the supervisor's gender. Factor analytic techniques were used to identify those bi-polar scales which succeeded in indexing the subjects' dispositions toward the target concepts. Composite scores of the identified scales were submitted to three-way ANOVA resulting in a significant main effect for supervisory approach favoring directive supervision and two significant interaction effects, supervisor sex X subject sex and supervisory approach X subject sex. These results are discussed in terms of their importance for supervisory behavior with student teachers.

Supervisory Approach and Gender Related Preferences of Teachers-in-Training

A common concern among most writers in instructional supervision is the question of which approach, directive or non-directive, should be assumed by a supervisor of teachers. A directive approach would have the supervisor influence the teacher by utilizing declarative sentences to offer opinions and suggestions. The directive supervisor is inclined to offer new information as he or she perceives that it is needed by the teacher. The intent of this supervisory approach is to provide immediate and useful advice and guidance designed to help the teacher successfully overcome instructional difficulties. By contrast, when using a non-directive approach, the supervisor interacts with the teacher by utilizing interrogative statements to solicit the teacher's opinions and encourage the teacher to make suggestions. The non-directive supervisor is more inclined to reflect the teacher's ideas and to offer new information only when asked by the teacher. The intent of this supervisory approach is to encourage the teacher to take responsibility for making and evaluating instructional decisions.

A considerable body of literature has accumulated in recent years which supports a non-directive approach. Based on the assumption that human beings, especially highly trained ones, are not motivated by authoritarian techniques, Oliva (1976) has proposed that a non-directive

supervisory approach is superior to a directive approach. Salek (1975) has suggested that, when supervisors are caught in the Helper versus Evaluator role paradox they should utilize non-directive techniques as a way to maintain credibility in both roles. (For additional discussion which supports the non-directive approach, see Bramer, 1973; Carkuff, 1969, 1972.)

Though preferences for non-directive supervision are both widely stated and, for many, philosophically attractive, the available empirical evidence is somewhat equivocal. In a survey of teachers, Blumberg and Weber (1968) found a positive relationship between teacher morale scores and the amount of emphasis that teachers saw their supervisors putting on non-directive behavior. In another survey of experienced teachers, however, Young and Heichberger (1975) detected a clear preference for helper behavior (defined as essentially directive in nature) over collegial behavior (defined as essentially non-directive in nature). Copeland and Atkinson (1978) reported a significant preference for directive over non-directive techniques by elementary student teachers. In light of the conflicting research results currently available, it is difficult to make difinitive statements about the preference of teachers for one style of supervisory behavior over another.

A second question concerning teachers' preferences needs exploration. This question relates to the possible effect the gender of the supervisor and/or teacher may have on the supervisory relationship. No research has been reported to date which explores such sex effects related to

supervision. It seems feasible, however, that research findings relative to other dyadic relationships may have implications for the supervisory relationship. For instance, it has been reported that opposite-sex experimenters are more potent reinforcers with both children (Stevenson, 1951) and adults (Stevenson & Allen, 1964) than are same-sex experimenters. While investigating counseling dyads, Brooks (1974) found that opposite-sex pairings resulted in more self-disclosure than same-sex pairings. This outcome is supported in part by Fuller's (1963) earlier finding that dyads containing a female result in more self-disclosure than all-male dyads. There is also evidence that female clients gain more from desensitization (Geer & Hurst, 1976) and assertative training (Janda & Rimm, 1977) when the counselor is a male than when the counselor is a female.

While these findings tend to favor cross-sex pairings, several studies have found contradicting evidence. Kohan (1975) examined the effect of same- and opposite-sex pairings on self-disclosure and found no evidence of an effect either way. Also examining self-disclosure, Hill (1975) actually found same-sex pairings resulted in more discussion of feelings than did cross-sex pairings. Simons and Helms (1976) reported that women preferred a female counselor over a male counselor.

The purpose of the present study was to examine the differential effects of (1) direct and non-direct supervisory approaches, (2) supervisor gender, and (3) subject gender on the affective dispositions of secondary student teachers for examples of supervisory behavior. In addition to examining these three main effects, the study was intended to shed light on possible interaction effects among the above factors.

Method

The plan of the present study was to use semantic differential techniques to record the affective dispositions of male and female student teachers toward recorded examples of supervisory conferences. These examples varied as to the approach used by the supervisor and the supervisor's and supervisee's gender. The subjects' expressed preferences were then processed using factor analytic techniques and submitted to 3-way analysis of variance.

Treatment

In order to provide examples of both directive and non-directive supervisory behavior, two scripts of a conference between a supervisor and a teacher were utilized.[2] These scripts, employed in an earlier study (Copeland & Atkinson, 1978), were of identical length (905 words) and had the same introductory and concluding statements. Each script dealt with the same teaching problem and proposed identical solutions. The vocabulary and sentence structure of the two scripts were kept as similar as possible.

The two scripts differed, systematically, however, with regard to the approach, directive or non-directive, exercised by the supervisor. In the script depicting directive supervision, the supervisor made twenty-nine declarative statements, twenty-five of which contained new information. By contrast, twelve declarative statements were made in the non-directive script, only two of which contained new information.

The directive supervisor asked five questions and reflected the teacher's ideas by paraphrasing four of his/her comments while the non-directive supervisor asked twenty-four questions and paraphrased ten teacher comments. Using Blumberg's (1974) adaptation to supervisory conferences of Flander's Interaction Analysis System, the ratio of non-directive supervisory behavior (asking for opinions and asking for suggestions) to directive behavior (giving opinions and giving suggestions) was calculated to be 3.2/1 for the non-directive script and .11/1 for the directive script.

In order to verify that the two scripts did not differ significantly in any way other than the two supervisory styles depicted, the dialogues were analyzed by three male and three female judges who were professional supervisors of field experiences in the Department of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara. After reading the two scripts (the order of presentation was reversed for half of the judges) the judges were first asked to independently record a preference for one script or another. They were then asked to write a paragraph describing any differences they perceived between the two scripts. The open-ended nature of this activity was designed to offer as much latitude as possible for identifying differences, if such differences existed. Finally, if they had not done so in the second step above, each judge was asked to use the words "directive" and "non-directive" to label the two scripts.

When indicating their initial preferences, all six judges selected the non-directive over the directive script. This unanimous selection was a potential source of concern. If it simply reflected the judges' preference

for a non-directive over directive supervisory style, it would verify that the scripts succeeded in representing appropriate differences. If, on the other hand, the judges' selections reflected a reaction to a separate characteristic of the scripts which was both strong and unintended, their utility for eliciting preferences for directive and non-directive supervisory style would be in serious question.

An examination of the judges' written descriptions of script differences revealed a consistent differentiation on the basis of supervisory approach. None of the judges' comments touched on any qualitative dimension other than supervisory approach. All succeeded in properly labeling the scripts when asked to do so. Further, when verbally questioned about the reasons for their preferences, all expressed an opinion that no characteristic other than directive and non-directive supervisory behavior differentiated the two scripts. It was therefore concluded that the scripts were appropriate sources of treatment for the present study.

Two audio-recordings were made from each script with professional actors portraying the supervisor and supervisee roles. For two recordings a female voice was used for the supervisor and a male voice for the teacher. In the other two recordings the male and female voices changed roles. Thus, four tapes were produced which crossed supervisor approach (directive or non-directive) with supervisor gender. (It should be noted here that, by switching the roles of supervisor and supervisee between male and female voices, the supervisor approach factor was necessarily crossed with both supervisor gender and the gender of the supervisee.

The possible limitations of this potential confounding characteristic will be discussed at a later point.) The two actors were naive as to the purpose of the study and were asked to keep the voice qualities of the supervisor and supervisee as comparable as possible under all four conditions.

As a final verification of the treatment, the six judges analyzed these four tape recordings. Each judge listened to two tapes, the tapes being systematically rotated so that each judge heard a different pair. In this analysis, the judges were asked to concentrate on the voices of the supervisor and the teacher rather than the content of the tapes.

The judges did not consistently identify any characteristic that differentiated the tapes other than supervisory style and gender of the voices. Though all judges expressed a preference for one tape or the other in the pair they heard, no consistent pattern of preferences for any single tape emerged. When questioned concerning their preferences, four judges indicated that their reaction was related only to supervisory style or voice gender. The remaining two judges felt they detected an additional quality that separated the tapes but disagreed as to what that quality was and, in fact, differed concerning their preference of the tape they listened to in common. In both cases they agreed that the differences they sensed were not strong. It was therefore concluded that the four tape recordings were faithful reproductions of the scripts, that they varied with respect to supervisory approach and the gender of the voices, and that they contained no other consistent differences that might effect the expressed preference of the listener.

Subjects and Procedure

The total population (N = 71) of secondary teaching credential candidates enrolled in a fifth year credential program at the University of California, Santa Barbara served as subjects for the study. All subjects had completed 22 weeks of student teaching and had experienced several supervisory encounters with their cooperating teachers and university supervisors. The subject pool was composed of 36 males and 35 females ranging in age from 21 to 38 ($\overline{X}$ = 24.43, SD = 3.52).

The experimenters met with the subjects during a regularly scheduled course meeting and asked those students present to assist in the evaluation of tape recordings that were to be used for training supervisors. Blocked by sex, the subjects were randomly assigned to four groups, sent to separate rooms and given an opportunity to listen to one of the four tape recordings. This assignment procedure yielded an experimental design which could be analyzed with a 3-way Analysis of Variance: It contained two levels of the blocking variable-subject gender, two levels of supervisory approach and two levels of supervisor gender.

Instrumentation

After listening to the assigned tape recording the subjects were asked to rate independently the supervisor's performance on a questionnaire which utilized a semantic differential format after Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). This instrument asked the respondents to use sixteen seven-point bi-polar scales to rate three concepts related to supervisor behavior. (See Table 2 for a list of these scales.)

As suggested by Davis (Note 1) the scales were chosen because of their meaningfulness to the evaluative dimension (Carter, Ruggels & Chaffee, 1968). One synonymous set of scales -- easy/difficult and simple/ difficult -- was included to provide an internal check of erratic response patterns.

The first two concepts, Supervisor's Expertness and Supervisor's Trustworthiness, were included to gain measures of perceived credibility assigned the supervisor. Research emanating from social psychology suggests that the greater the credibility of the communicator, the greater opinion and behavior change of the listener(s) (Aronson, Turner & Carlsmith, 1963; Bockner & Inski, 1966). Two major components of communicator credibility have been identified as expertness and trustworthiness (Hovland, Janis & Kelly, 1953). Since opinion and behavior change in teachers is a primary goal of supervisors, the importance of perceived supervisor expertness and trustworthiness is obvious. These two components were therefore used as the first two concepts in the questionnaire. The third concept, the Supervisor is Someone I Would See if I Wanted Supervision, was included to measure the supervisor's perceived utility, a second characteristic necessary for effective supervision.

Data Analysis

Eight student subjects were absent from school during the time of data collection, leaving a total of 63 who listened to the tapes. Preliminary examination revealed nine questionnaires which were either incomplete or characterized by internal inconsistency. These were discarded leaving 54 completed questionnaires available for further analysis.

The purpose of this data analysis was to determine the preference or affective disposition held by the subjects for the taped treatments in terms of the three target concepts. Davis (Note 1) has maintained that affective response information contained in semantic differential responses is a measure of the evaluative dimension of the semantic space. The focus in the present study was, therefore, on this evaluative dimension. Because of the possibility of concept-scale interaction, it was not possible to predict from the findings of previous studies which scales would have evaluative meaning for the target concepts in the present study (Heise, 1969). Therefore, as a first step in the analysis of the data, it was necessary to determine which of the sixteen scales used in the instrument successfully indexed each of the three target concepts. Following a procedure proposed by Davis (Note 1), for each of the three concepts the pooled values of the sixteen bi-polar scales were submitted to principal component factor analysis. An examination of the loadings of the scales on the first unrotated factor extracted from each of the three matrices enabled the selection in each case of those scales which loaded highest (above .700 in the present case) and were presumed to index the evaluative dimension. The first factor loadings for each of the three concepts are provided in Table 1. Nine of the sixteen scales loaded above .700 for the concepts "Expertness" and "Trustworthiness" and ten scales loaded above .700 for "Would Go See".

Insert Table 1 about here

As a result of this procedure it was possible to hold with confidence that the identified scales, taken together, indexed the preference or affective disposition of the subjects. It was, therefore, not necessary to complete separate statistical tests on each scale, a procedure in which the likelihood of Type I statistical error would be very large. Instead, the selected scales for each concept were summed over to produce a composite score. The resulting composite scores on the three concepts for each subject were then used to test the hypotheses proposed for this study. There is no reason to maintain that this initial data processing would effect the results of subsequent analysis.

Results

All subjects had been assigned to one of eight experimental groups which reflected the two levels of each of the three independent variables: (A) supervisor sex, (B) supervisory approach, and (C) subject sex. The mean composite scores for these groups are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Three unweighted means analyses of variance (Winer, 1971) were computed, one each for the two concepts related to supervisor credibility and one for the concept related to supervisor utility. The results are reported in Table 3. For all three concepts, the main effect of supervisory approach was found to be significant and to be due to higher

mean ratings given the directive supervisory approach than given the non-directive supervisory approach when collapsed across supervisor sex and subject sex.

Insert Table 3 about here

With similar consistency across concepts, the interaction effects of supervisor sex by subject sex and supervisory approach by subject sex were also found to be significant.

Insert Table 4 about here

Discussion

Within the limits imposed by sampling of secondary credential students at a single major university campus, the results clearly indicate a preference by teachers-in-training for a directive supervisory approach over a non-directive approach. This preference stands in contradiction to much of the current theoretical writing in the area of instructional supervision while it supports earlier findings which indicated a similar preference by elementary school teachers-in-training (Copeland & Atkinson, 1978). One inference that might be drawn from these findings is that teachers-in-training feel they lack the experiential background needed to resolve their teaching problems under non-directive supervision. A directive supervisory style in which the

supervisor pinpoints the problem and offers concrete solutions may appeal to student teachers attempting to cope with the day-to-day struggles concomitant with their marginal role. Supervision theorists, in promoting values that underlie non-directive supervision such as professional autonamy, realization of human potential and self-actualization, may have overlooked the day-to-day needs of teachers-in-training.

An ancillary result of the present study should be recalled here. In the process of verifying the treatment tapes, the six experienced supervisors who acted as judges were asked to choose which script, directive or non-directive they preferred. They unanimously chose the non-directive script. Unlike the judges, the subjects registered a significant preference for the directive approach. Though this inconsistancy between supervisors' and teacher trainees' preferences may simply be the reaction of the trainees against their supervisors' excessive use of the non-directive approach, such a simple interpretation is unlikely. Five of the six supervisor/judges had no contact with any of the subjects and the sixth worked with less than one fifth of them. The other judges worked with students who did not participate in the study. A more likely interpretation of the inconsistency is that it reflects a difference between the judges' acceptance of a currently popular value position which favors non-directive supervisory behavior and the subjects' perceived need for direct assistance in order to survive and succeed in student teaching.

It should be noted that the present results do not directly support an arguement for one supervisory approach being better than the other. Rather, they indicate that the sampled student teacher recipients of supervision tend to prefer the directive over the non-directive approach. Whether one approach or the other is ultimately more effective in terms of supervisee professional growth remains an empirical question. It seems logical, however, that a relationship between a supervisor and a supervisee is more likely to continue and to be productive if the supervisee perceives the supervisor's approach as being appropriate. The possibility of a direct correlation between supervisees' preferences and effectiveness of the supervisory relationship offers an area for further investigation.

In addition to the main effect of supervisory aporoach, evidence of a significant disordinal interaction effect between supervisor and subject gender was also found. On preliminary examination this outcome suggests that subjects preferred supervisors of the opposite sex over those of the same sex. Caution must be exercised, however, in accepting this interpretation. Each treatment tape contained not only a supervisor's voice but that of a supervisee as well. A preference for a tape which featured an opposite-sex supervisor is also a preference for a tape featuring a same-sex supervisee. The possibility exists that, instead of a cross-sex supervisor preference, these findings reflect the tendency of the subjects to identify most comfortably with a tape which has a same-sex supervisee. Though it is not clear which of these two

interpretations adequately explains the findings, a preference for opposite-sex supervisors conforms with other research findings where opposite-sex experimenters proved to be more potent reinforcers (Stevenson, 1961; Stevenson & Allen, 1964) and more effective counselors (Brooks, 1974; Geer & Hurst, 1976; Janda & Rimm, 1977). Still, an additional research effort which varies the gender of the two voices four ways is needed to verify this interpretation.

Examination of Table 2 reveals an interesting tendency that may have a bearing on this cross-sex interaction. While male subjects were quite consistent in their preferences for the directive over the non-directive supervisory approach, regardless of the supervisor's sex, the differences were not very large. By contrast, the differences in the scores of the female subjects was much larger. Further, the females gave their highest ratings to the male supervisor who employed a non-directive approach (expert = 5.339; trust = 6.268; utility = 5.571) and their lowest ratings to the female supervisor who used the same approach (expert = 2.969; trust = 3.750; utility = 3.361). Though such a large difference did not occur in other combinations within Table 2, its occurrence in the scores of female subjects rating non-directive tapes may be the source of much of the interaction effect found between supervisor gender and subject gender. Possible reasons for this discrepancy are quite intriguing. It may be, for instance, the result of a feminist awareness effect. This hypothesis assumes that female teachers-in-training in the late 1970's are somewhat disdainful of a woman who portrays the

"traditional" passive role while in a position of perceived power. A male supervisor, on the other hand, who allows his female supervisee to generate her own solutions to a problematic teaching situation might be viewed quite positively by pro-feminist females.

The results also indicate a significant ordinal interaction effect between supervisory approach and subject sex. Consistently across the three concepts, males indicated a greater preference for the directive approach and a lessor preference for the non-directive approach than did the females. Male subjects exhibited a tendency to make a larger differentiation between the two supervisory styles than did female subjects.

A simple explanation for this interaction which suggests that males generally are more polarized in their affective dispositions than are females is not supported by the values for the subject gender by supervisor gender interaction reported above. In that interaction, the females evidenced consistently larger differences than did males when evaluations were pooled by supervisor gender. A more plausible hypothesis is that young males in our society are more socialized to value practical solutions to the pragmatic problems they face in their day to day existence than are young females.

The question of whether similar or differing preferences exist among experienced teachers remains to be answered. The methodology employed in the present study, i.e., utilizing semantic differential techniques to record affective dispositions of subject samples from identified populations to specimens of rigorously controlled supervisory conferences,

would seem appropriate for pursuing answers to such a question. Also, if sufficient subjects were available, this methodology could be combined with factor analytic techniques to explore possible relationships among preferences for supervisory styles and variables such as those related to personality, environment and experience. Pursuit of such a line of research could help to clarify the conditions under which directive and non-directive styles of supervisory behavior are perceived as most appropriate by supervisees.

Using this methodology, it would be possible to vary the content of the supervisory sessions along dimensions other than directive/non-directive supervisory behavior. Other possible dimensions could include qualified vs. unqualified praise (Farson, 1963; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959), informational vs. opinionative statements (Blumberg, 1974), open vs. closed questions (Benjamin, 1969), and use of freeing vs. binding statements (Hale & Spanjer, 1970). Further, it may be possible to undertake an examination of various recommended agendas for supervisory conferences (for examples see Boyan & Copeland, 1978; Cogan, 1973; and Goldhammer, 1969).

In summary, the present summary has produced evidence suggesting that student teachers prefer directive over non-directive supervision. A significant interaction effect was found between supervisory approach and subject gender suggesting the preference for the directive approach may be qualified by the student teacher's sex. Evidence was also found that teachers-in-training prefer supervisors of the opposite sex

although conclusive statments to this effect must await further research that controls for the model supervisee's sex. Because of the limitations of the sample, generalization of the results reported here to larger populations is difficult. Yet, because the results complement those findings reported earlier with elemenatry student teachers (Copeland & Atkinson, 1978) there is reason to believe a preference for the directive approach to supervision exists, at least among student teachers.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Davis, R. W., Development of an appropriate method for applying the semantic differential to the measurement of affective outcomes of instruction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New York, 1977.

REFERENCES

Aronson, E., Turner, J.A., and Carlsmith, J.M. Communicator credibility and communication discrepency as determinants of opinion change. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 31-36.

Benjamin, A. The helping interview. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1969.

Blumberg, A. Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974.

Blumberg, A., and Weber, W.A. Teacher morale as a function of perceived supervisor behavioral style. Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 62, 109-113.

Bockner, S., and Inski, C.A. Communicator discrepancy, source credibility and opinion change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 614-621.

Boyan, N.J., and Copeland, W.D. The instructional supervision training program. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1978.

Brammer, L.M. The helping relationship: Process and skills. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Brooks, L. Interactive effects of sex ans status on self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 4-4.

Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and human relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Carkhuff, R. R. Some reflections on helping and human resources development models. The Counseling Psychologist, 1972, 3, 79-87.

Carter, R., Ruggels, W., and Chaffee, S. The semantic differential in opinion measurement. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1968, 38, 666-679.

Cogan, M. L. Clinical supervision. Boston, Houghton Mifflin. 1973.

Copeland, W. D. and Atkinson, D. R. Student teachers' perceptions of directive and non-directive supervisory behavior. Journal of Educational Research. 1978, 71, 123-127.

Farson, R.E. Praise reappraised. Harvard Business Review. 1963, 41, 61-66.

Fuller, F. J. Influence of sex of counselor and of client on expressions of feeling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 34-40.

Geer, C.A., and Hurst, J.C. Counselor-subject sex variables in systematic desensitization. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1976, 4, 296-301.

Goldhammer, R. Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Hale, J.R., and Spanjer, R.A. Systematic and objective analysis of instruction. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1970.

Heise, D.R. Some methodological issues in semantic differential research. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 72, 406-422.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. Motivation and work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Hill, C.E. Sex of client and sex and experience level of counselor. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 6-11.

Hoveland, C.I., Janis, I.L., and Kelly, H.H. Communications and persuasion. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1953.

Janda, L.H., and Rimm, D.C. Type of situation and sex of counselor in assertive training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 444-447.

Kohan, J.A.S. The development of reciprocal self-disclosure in opposite-sex interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 404-410.

Oliva, P.F. Supervision for today's schools. New York: Thomas Y. Cromwell Co., 1976.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G., and Tannenbaum, P. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Salek, C.J. Helping teachers vs. evaluating teachers. NASSP Bulletin, 1975, 59, 34-38.

Simons, J.A., and Helms, J.E. Influence of counselors' marital status, sex and age on college and non-college women's counselor preferences. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 380-386.

Stevenson, H.W. Social reinforcement with children as a function of chronological age, sex of experimenter and sex of subject. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 147-154.

Winer, B.J. Statiscal principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Young, J.M., and Heichberger, R.L. Teachers' perceptions of an effective school supervision and evaluation program. Education, 1975, 96 10-19.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The author is grateful to Donald R. Atkinson for his extensive help and perceptive suggestions during the conduct of this research project and to Lawrence J. Hubert and Vernon E. Cotter for their comments on earlier drafts. Requests for reprints should be addressed to Willis D. Copeland, Department of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106.

[2]Copies of the scripts may be obtained by writing to the author.

TABLE 1

Principal Component First Factor Loadings in Sixteen Bi-polar Scales for Each of Three Concepts

Scales	Concepts		
	Expertness	Trustworthiness	Would Go See
Worthless-Valuable	.893*	.814*	.903*
Knowable-Unknowable	.703*	.726*	.877*
Easy-Difficult	.160	.384	.518
Bad-Good	.838*	.906*	.944*
Fast-Slow	.553	.615	.660
Small-Large	.804*	.761*	.804*
Exciting-Boring	.869*	.872*	.892*
Orderly-Cluttered	.394	.557	.407
Active-Passive	.561	.640	.683
Interesting-Dull	.912*	.779*	.936*
Confusing-Understandable	.432	.502	.782*
Simple-Difficult	.130	.334	.325
Strong-Weak	.805*	.765*	.894*
Useful-Useless	.916*	.859*	.872*
Effortless-Demanding	.365	.000	.064
Important-Unimportant	.932*	.847*	.898*

* = scale selected for composite index

TABLE 2

Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations of Supervisor Expertness, Trustworthiness, and Utility by Subject Sex, Supervisor Sex, and Supervisory Approach

Supervisory Role	Male Subject						Female Subject					
	Male Supervisor			Female Supervisor			Male Supervisor			Female Supervisor		
	$\bar{X}$	sd	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	n
Supervisor Expertness												
Non-Directive	3.107	1.65	7	3.500	1.01	6	5.339	1.56	7	2.969	1.47	8
Directive	5.179	1.002	7	5.125	1.74	6	4.688	.98	6	4.196	1.23	7
Supervisor Trustworthiness												
Non-Directive	3.125	1.73	7	4.208	1.44	6	6.268	1.49	7	3.750	1.07	8
Directive	5.661	1.31	7	5.667	1.37	6	5.604	1.07	6	4.875	1.72	7
Supervisor Utility												
Non-Directive	2.746	1.82	7	3.296	1.55	6	5.571	2.24	7	3.361	1.93	8
Directive	5.508	1.37	7	6.204	1.38	6	5.315	1.13	6	4.270	1.91	7

TABLE 3

ANOVA of Mean Composite Scores on Supervisory Approach, Supervisor Gender and Subject Gender for Three Concepts

Supervisor Expertness			
Supervisory Approach (A)	1	15.256	8.100**
Supervisor Gender (B)	1	5.318	2.823
Subject Gender (C)	1	0.066	0.035
A X B	1	1.716	0.911
A X C	1	8.139	4.321*
B X C	1	8.564	4.547*
A X B X C	1	4.522	2.401
Unit	46	1.883	
Supervisor Trustworthiness			
Supervisory Approach (A)	1	16.591	8.234**
Supervisor Gender (B)	1	3.891	1.931
Subject Gender (C)	1	2.818	1.399
A X B	1	0.423	0.210
A X C	1	10.431	5.177**
B X C	1	15.716	7.800**
A X B X C	1	6.866	3.408
Unit	46	2.015	
Supervisor Utility			
Supervisory Approach (A)	1	33.400	11.205**
Supervisor Gender (B)	1	3.374	1.132
Subject Gender (C)	1	0.487	0.163
A X B	1	1.436	0.482
A X C	1	21.039	6.058*
B X C	1	16.935	5.682*
A X B X C	1	0.869	0.292
Unit	46	2.981	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 4

Two-Way Statistics for Significant Interaction Effects of Subject Gender by Supervisor Gender and by Supervisory Approach for Three Concepts

Subject Gender	Supervisor Gender		Supervisory Approach		Row
	Female	Male	Directive	Non-Directive	
Supervisor Expertness					
Female	3.583	5.013	4.442	4.154	4.298
Male	4.313	4.143	5.152	3.304	4.228
(Column)	3.948	4.578	4.797	3.729	4.263
Supervisor Trustworthiness					
Female	4.313	5.936	5.240	5.009	5.124
Male	4.937	4.393	5.664	3.667	4.665
(Column)	4.625	5.164	5.452	4.338	4.895
Supervisor Utility					
Female	3.815	5.443	4.792	4.466	4.629
Male	4.750	4.127	5.856	3.021	4.438
(Column)	4.283	4.785	5.324	3.744	4.534